

their tireless efforts. Mr. President, I offer my thanks to all of those individuals, congregations, and charitable organizations who respond with such compassion and energy when disaster strikes.

RETIREMENT OF DR. SHELDON HACKNEY AS CHAIRMAN OF THE NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, earlier this week Sheldon Hackney, chairman of the National Endowment for the Humanities, announced that he would be leaving office and returning to teaching at the end of his term of office in August. Dr. Hackney came to the endowment in 1993, following a brilliant academic and administrative career, including service as president of the University of Pennsylvania.

News of his retirement saddens all of us who know what a superb job he has done at the endowment for the past 4 years. Perhaps his most notable achievement has been in taming the intense political controversies that were swirling around the endowment when he arrived. The controversies persist, but fortunately, they are muted because of his leadership. The endowment has earned new bipartisan support because of the effective way he has explained its important mission to liberals and conservatives alike. He will be greatly missed, but I wish him well.

Asked about his views on eliminating the endowment, Dr. Hackney responded with characteristic eloquence,

The only legitimate argument against continuing it is from someone who believes in a minimalist government, that government shouldn't be in culture at all. The endowment does things that no one else would do but need to be done if we are to remember who we are and what the heritage of our nation is.

I ask unanimous consent that an article from the New York Times about Dr. Hackney may be printed at this point in the RECORD. The humanity of the man shines through, and through him the humanities endowment has shone through as well.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 21, 1997]

CHAIRMAN TO LEAVE HUMANITIES ENDOWMENT
(By Irvin Molotsky)

WASHINGTON, April 21.—Sheldon Hackney, who has led the National Endowment for the Humanities during a period of reduced budgets, told the White House today that he would not seek another term as chairman and would return to the University of Pennsylvania to teach history.

Mr. Hackney, who stepped down as president of Penn to come to Washington four years ago, said today that he had planned all along to step down when his four-year term expired in August.

"I never discussed it with the White House," he said, "but I'm sure I could have stayed."

The endowment, which provides Federal money for research and exhibitions on history and other scholarly pursuits, has been

less of a lightning rod for fiscal conservatives than its counterpart, the National Endowment for the Arts. But it has been bracketed with the arts endowment as the target of spending cuts and its budget has been reduced in recent years.

When asked about his disappointments as chairman, Mr. Hackney said: "The political situation changed, and I had to spend more time than I wanted telling the public and Congress what we do. I could have spent that time on programs."

The change in the political situation that Mr. Hackney spoke of was the Republican takeover of Congress in 1994, when many opponents of Federal spending for the arts and humanities were elected to the House and Senate.

Spending for the humanities endowment has fallen from a high of \$172 million in 1993 to \$110 million in the current budget. President Clinton has asked for \$136 million for next year, but Congress is unlikely to approve that much.

"Despite the turbulence of the times," Mr. Hackney said, "I feel very good. We've accomplished a lot."

Besides keeping the endowment alive, Mr. Hackney said, his accomplishments include making the endowment nonpolitical and nonideological, reversing a pattern that he said took hold during the Reagan and Bush Administrations.

Asked to provide a defense for continuing the endowment, Mr. Hackney said: "The only legitimate argument against continuing it is from someone who believes in minimalist government, that government shouldn't be in culture at all. The endowment does things that no one else would do but need to be done if we are to remember who we are and what the heritage of our nation is."

"One of the purposes of government is to create good citizens. That's what we do at the N.E.H. We are a democratizing force in American culture."

Representative Sidney R. Yates, Democrat of Illinois, an advocate of both endowments who was chairman of the House committee that approved their financing when the Democrats were in the majority, said he thought Mr. Hackney has succeeded in removing the endowment from partisan politics.

"We'll miss him," Mr. Yates said. "I think he's been very good. He's been a very good administrator of the humanities endowment at a difficult time with less money."

Representative Ralph Regula, Republican of Ohio, who is chairman of the appropriations panel Mr. Yates once led, said of Mr. Hackney, "I think he's worked hard at giving the N.E.H. good leadership, especially in the field of libraries."

Asked whether Mr. Hackney had kept politics and ideology out of the endowment, Representative Regula said, "He has been very successful in that regard." He added, however, that he thought Mr. Hackney's Republican predecessors had also kept partisanship out.

A Republican critic of the endowment, Representative John T. Doolittle, a Californian, said it spent money on uneeded programs, money that could be better used "to save Medicare from bankruptcy and balance the budget."

"If there were ever a Federal agency or program that deserves a trip to the chopping block, it is this sandbox for the cultural elite," Mr. Doolittle said.

Mr. Regula did not agree with his Republican colleague. "I think it will survive in some form or another," he said. "I think the preservation of the culture of society is important."

Mr. Hackney said the endowment had supported many good projects without getting

much credit for it, like providing some of the money for public television programs on Theodore Roosevelt and the American West.

"The public doesn't normally notice who is funding projects," he said. "People say: 'Oh, my goodness. Did you do that?'"

Mr. Hackney, an Alabamian, said that at Penn he would return to one his great interests by teaching a course on the history of the South.

When he was named chairman of the endowment, Mr. Hackney was succeeded by Judith S. Rodin as university president.

"I'm going to teach history and stay out of her way," Mr. Hackney said.

SENATE IMMIGRATION SUBCOMMITTEE ANALYSIS OF 1996 INS LEGAL IMMIGRATION NUMBERS

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, yesterday, the Immigration and Naturalization Service [INS] officially released its legal immigration numbers for 1996. Attached please find an analysis by the staff of the Senate Immigration Subcommittee that helps place these numbers into context.

The analysis finds:

First, the 1996 increase in immigration is not part of a long-term rise in legal immigration but rather a temporary increase.

Second, many additional people being counted as immigrants in 1996 and 1997 were not new entrants but were already physically in the country as the spouses of those who received amnesty under the law signed by President Reagan in 1986.

Third, the increase is due largely to INS processing delays that caused many people who would have been counted as immigrants in 1995 to be counted in 1996.

Fourth, after a 20-percent decline between 1993 and 1995, this short-term increase in legal immigration numbers is expected to be followed by another decline to previous levels within 2 to 3 years.

And finally, in historical terms, legal immigration is moderate when measured as a percentage of the U.S. population—0.3 percent—the most accurate measurement of immigrants' economic and demographic impact. Numerically, legal immigration in 1996 was below the level recorded on 10 other occasions since 1904.

As chairman of the Senate Immigration Subcommittee, I hope this analysis sheds light on the legal immigration numbers released yesterday by INS. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Immigration Subcommittee's analysis of the 1996 INS legal immigration numbers be included in the RECORD. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows: